

The Transformation of Koxinga's Identity Across Historical Periods: A Literature Review Based on Historical Analysis and Secondary Sources

Yu-shen Fang

Economics and Management College, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing City, China.

* **Correspondence:** Yu-shen Fang

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.



Received: 25-July-2025

Revised: 10-August-2025

Accepted: 11-August-2025

Published: 12-August-2025

Copyright © 2025, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

This article is published by **MSI Publishers** in **MSI Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR)**

ISSN 3049-0669 (Online)

Volume: 2, Issue: 8 (August-2025)

ABSTRACT: Zheng Chenggong, more widely known as "Koxinga," is a pivotal figure in East Asian history, renowned for his resistance against the Qing dynasty and for successfully expelling the Dutch East India Company (Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie, VOC) from Taiwan between 1661 and 1662. Scholars from both Eastern and Western traditions have interpreted Koxinga through a range of perspectives, portraying him variously as a pirate king, maritime merchant, loyalist of the Ming dynasty, faithful servant, conqueror, heretic, national hero, anti-Qing leader, son of Japan, and the "Sacred King Who Opened Taiwan." These competing representations highlight how interpretations of Koxinga's identity have been shaped by the interplay between historical narratives and political power. This study employs historical analysis and secondary literature to examine the evolution of Koxinga's identity across different historical contexts. It not only offers a more comprehensive understanding of his historical actions but also provides deeper insights into the complex values embedded in his legacy—such as loyalty, resistance, anti-colonialism, expansion, maritime trade, sea power, and cultural identity.

Keywords: *ethnic identity, Koxinga, national identity, the Netherlands, pirate king*

1. Introduction

According to Chinese historical records, Zheng Chenggong (鄭成功)—commonly known as Koxinga (國姓爺)—was a prominent figure during the late Ming and early Qing dynasties. His father, Zheng Zhilong (鄭芝龍), was a Ming official who also engaged in maritime commerce, piracy, and smuggling, while his mother, Tagawa Matsu (田川松), came from a samurai family in Hirado, Japan. As a loyalist of the fallen Ming dynasty, Zheng Chenggong harbored the ideal of national restoration. He led the remaining Ming forces in effective resistance against the Manchu-led Qing army and successfully expelled the Dutch East India Company (Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie, VOC) from Taiwan in 1662. There, he established a military base committed to restoring the Ming regime and even planned an expedition to conquer the Spanish-held island of Luzon (now Philippines) (Tai, 2001).

Zheng Chenggong's influence is evident in his resistance against the Qing dynasty aimed at restoring the Ming, as well as in his maritime military and trade strategies. His impact extended significantly across the East Asian maritime region, affecting Western colonial powers. Remarkably, over the course of more than 300 years, Zheng's image has transcended both the temporal and geographic boundaries of his lifetime. His identity has undergone multiple transformations across different historical periods and regions—such as in Eastern contexts including China, Taiwan, and Japan, as well as Western contexts such as the Netherlands, Spain, and Portugal—and continues to be reconstructed and reshaped within various national and regional narratives to this day.

This study employs the Historical Analysis Method and utilizes secondary literature sources—including historical chronicles, official archives, academic articles, government publications, and digital media—to examine how Zheng Chenggong's identity has been constructed across different historical periods. Historical analysis is a qualitative research approach that systematically reviews historical documents to

reveal long-term evolutionary trajectories with clarity. The objectives of this study are as follows:

(1) To apply the Historical Analysis Method in conjunction with diverse secondary sources to review the evolution of Zheng Chenggong's identity and image across various countries, regions, and historical contexts;

(2) To explore how Zheng Chenggong's identity has been continuously constructed and reshaped over time—from the seventeenth century to the contemporary twenty-first century—including key periods such as the Ming-Qing transition and colonial era; the rise of modern nationalism; Japanese colonial rule; the post-World War II period; and the context of globalization and cross-Strait relations.

This research transcends traditional nation-centric historiography by incorporating multiple perspectives from both Eastern and Western sources, including recent indigenous Taiwanese viewpoints. The findings not only enrich the understanding of Zheng Chenggong's multifaceted identity but also contribute to a deeper comprehension of the diverse values embedded in his spiritual legacy—such as loyalty and righteousness, resistance, maritime power, maritime trade, anti-colonialism, and cultural identity. Furthermore, this study proposes potential directions for future research.

2. The Image of Koxinga in the Ming and Qing Periods

2.1 The Image of Koxinga in the Southern Ming Dynasty

Zheng Chenggong's (Koxinga) identity and image are multi-layered: he was simultaneously a military leader, a loyal minister, a maritime merchant hegemon, and a ruler of naval power. By consolidating the fleet and maritime trade networks inherited from his father, Zheng Zhilong, Zheng Chenggong established a maritime domain centered around Xiamen and Kinmen that controlled the East Asian seas and fulfilled both military and commercial functions. He was the sole force within the Southern Ming dynasty capable of posing a significant threat to the Manchu-led Qing dynasty.

In October 1645, the Ming Emperor Longwu (Zhu Yujian), seeking to secure the allegiance of the Zheng family, granted the then 22-year-old Zheng Sen the imperial surname “Zhu” and bestowed upon him the given name “Chenggong.” He was also conferred the noble title Zhongxiao Bo (Count of Loyalty and Filial Piety) ([Ming] Peng, n.d., vol.1: 46). The bestowal of the imperial surname “Zhu” signified that Emperor Longwu regarded Zheng Sen as his adoptive son (Wills, 1974). Zheng Sen was known by multiple names, including Zheng Chenggong, Zhu Chenggong, and the honorific “Koxinga”. This act elevated Zheng from merely being the son of a maritime merchant to a “symbol of the Ming imperial clan,” thereby strengthening the legitimacy of resistance against the Qing dynasty. He became one of the Southern Ming dynasty’s most important military leaders and was regarded by the scholarly class as “the last loyalist.” Subsequently, in 1653, the Yongli Emperor of the Ming dynasty (Zhu Youlang) conferred upon Zheng the title of King of Yanping and bestowed upon him a golden seal. This honorary conferment further consolidated Zheng’s allegiance to the Yongli Emperor, acknowledged his de facto rule, and sought to leverage his power in the struggle against the Qing.

According to *Pi Hai Ji You* ([Qing] Yu, n.d., under the roll: 42), Zheng commanded a formidable naval force and controlled large portions of the southeastern coastline. His navy was widely regarded as the only maritime power capable of resisting the Qing military advance. In February 1662, Zheng successfully expelled the VOC from Taiwan, thereby dismantling the Dutch colonial administration in Formosa (Taiwan). However, only four months later, in June 1662, the Yongli Emperor was captured and executed by Qing forces, signaling the definitive fall of the Southern Ming dynasty. In response, Zheng declared Taiwan a new stronghold for Southern Ming restoration, inaugurating the so-called Ming Zheng period. This era upheld the symbolic legitimacy of the Southern Ming dynasty and sought to perpetuate its cultural and political legacy from Taiwan. Under Zheng’s governance, Taiwan experienced substantial agricultural, economic, and cultural development.

In Taiwan, Zheng Chenggong is worshipped as the “Sacred King Who Opened Taiwan” for his role in expelling the Dutch and developing the island. His legacy is deeply woven into Taiwan’s cultural memory, historical consciousness, and political

discourse. Nonetheless, Zheng's professed loyalty to the defunct Southern Ming dynasty has long been contested in scholarly discourse, particularly within Western academia. Croizier (1977) questioned the sincerity of Zheng's loyalty, proposing that it functioned more as a strategic tool to legitimize his maritime trade activities—including smuggling—than as an expression of dynastic fidelity. He further argued that traditional Chinese historiography had overstated Zheng's loyalist credentials. Similarly, Clements (2005) portrayed Zheng as being driven more by personal ambition and material interests than by ideological devotion to the Southern Ming.

Conversely, Hang (2015) highlighted Zheng's efforts to establish a Ming-style administrative framework in Siming Prefecture (now Xiamen) and cited his correspondence with the Qing court as evidence of a genuine commitment to the Ming cause. Wills (1974) also emphasized that Zheng's northern expedition to Nanjing between 1657 and 1659 had dual motivations: ideological resistance to Qing rule and the practical goal of reclaiming economic and political resources in Jiangnan. Thus, Western scholars remain divided over whether Zheng should be interpreted as a principled loyalist or a pragmatic opportunist. This scholarly debate reflects broader challenges in interpreting political motives during periods of dynastic transition and socio-political upheaval.

2.2 The Image of Koxinga in the Qing Dynasty

The Qing dynasty's official appraisal of Zheng Chenggong evolved in response to shifting political needs, transitioning from hostility and denigration to eventual rehabilitation.

Early Qing Period (1662–1683): In early Qing sources, such as the *Veritable Records of the Qing (Qing Shilu)* ([Qing] Ma, Zhang, Jiang, & Zhu, n.d., vol. 6: 155) and the *Selected Records from the Donghua Archives (Donghua Lu Xuanji)* ([Qing] Jiang, L. Q., n.d.: 131, 150), Zheng Chenggong was consistently referred to as the “maritime rebel Zheng Chenggong” or “son of the pirate Zheng Zhilong.” These texts emphasized his piratical background while deliberately downplaying the political significance of his Southern Ming loyalism and anti-Qing resistance. As a remnant official of the fallen Southern Ming dynasty, Zheng was portrayed by the

Qing as a traitor and insurrectionist, symbolizing defiance against the new Manchu regime.

Mid-Qing Period (18th Century): By the mid-Qing period, particularly after the Qing had consolidated control over Taiwan, Zheng Chenggong's contributions to the island's development were more readily acknowledged in local historical records. For instance, in the *Gazetteer of Taiwan Prefecture (Taiwan Fu Zhi)*, Zheng's governance was noted; however, official narratives continued to frame his regime as “usurping and illegitimate regimes”, thereby minimizing any anti-Qing connotations ([Qing] Gao, n.d.). In 1700 (the 39th year of the Kangxi reign), Zheng Keshuang, citing the difficulty of performing ancestral rites across the Taiwan Strait, submitted a memorial to the Qing court requesting the relocation and reburial of the remains of Zheng Chenggong and his descendants in their ancestral homeland. To effectively govern and pacify the Fujianese and Cantonese settlers already residing in Taiwan, the Kangxi Emperor issued an edict permitting the remains of Zheng, Zheng Jing, and others to be reinterred in Nan'an, Quanzhou, Fujian. In addition, a plaque inscribed with the phrase “loyal to the sovereign” was conferred in their honor (Lian, n.d.). The Kangxi Emperor did not label them as rebels or separatists but instead objectively recognized Zheng's status as a “remnant official of the fallen Ming dynasty” (Wang, 2005). Another account suggests that the emperor ordered the reburial of the Zheng family members from their graves in Taiwan to their ancestral homeland to prevent anti-Qing sentiment among the Fujianese and Cantonese settlers.

Late Qing Period (19th Century): Zheng Chenggong's image was appropriated as a symbol of resistance against foreign aggression during the era of Western imperial encroachment in China. Following the First Opium War in 1840, amid increasing Western invasions, members of the gentry class—such as Lin Zexu (林則徐)—invoked Zheng's expulsion of the Dutch as a historical precedent to inspire patriotic resistance against foreign powers (Zheng, n.d.: 118–119). During the Mudan Incident (1871–1874), in 1874 (the 13th year of the Tongzhi reign), Taiwanese gentry such as Yang Shifang (楊士芳) submitted a petition to Imperial Commissioner Shen

Baozhen (沈葆楨). Together with other officials, Shen presented a memorial to the Qing court, requesting that Zheng, the Yanping King of the former Southern Ming dynasty, be posthumously honored and that a temple be erected in his name to serve as a symbol of loyalty and righteousness for the people of Taiwan ([Qing] Shen, n.d.; [Qing] Zhu, n.d.). In 1875, the Guangxu Emperor approved the request, formally recognizing Zheng's status. This act lifted the Qing dynasty's century-long condemnation of him as a rebel. By appropriating the popular veneration of Zheng in Taiwan, the Qing court strategically reframed his legacy—transforming his image of patriotic loyalty into a moral exemplar for Qing subjects (Zhang, 2019). By the end of the Qing dynasty, anti-Qing revolutionary groups—such as the Revive China Society (Xingzhonghui)—also reimagined Zheng as a Han hero resisting Manchu (Qing) domination, deploying his image in service of their revolutionary cause.

The Qing dynasty's shifting recognition of Zheng Chenggong—from condemnation to respect—was driven by both geopolitical considerations and internal political necessity. The Mudan Incident, for instance, made Taiwan's strategic importance more apparent to the Qing court. Equally significant was Zheng's enduring symbolic power among the island's inhabitants. By reinterpreting him as a paragon of loyalty to the emperor and love of country, rather than as a rebel, the Qing sought to appropriate his legacy to foster domestic unity and bolster resistance to external threats. In doing so, they reconfigured his anti-Qing, pro-Ming agenda into a narrative congruent with Qing imperial values.

3. The Image of Koxinga in Western Literature

Western literature sources refer to Zheng Chenggong as "Koxinga," recognizing him as a late Southern Ming hero who was the first to repel a European colonial power—the Dutch—using superior naval strength (Hsu, 2014; Nie, 1998). He is regarded as a pivotal figure in the 17th-century struggle for maritime dominance in Asia. By capturing Taiwan from the VOC and establishing the "Ming Zheng regime" as part of his resistance against the Qing and efforts to restore the Ming dynasty, Zheng significantly weakened the VOC's influence in East Asia. His actions exemplify the broader geopolitical and commercial rivalries among Western powers in the region

during that era (Tsai, 2015). Western interpretations of Koxinga are diverse, though they commonly emphasize his maritime activities, which integrated piracy, commerce, and military strategy. For example, Andrade (2011) views the conquest of Dutch Taiwan as a decisive moment in early Sino-Western conflict. He highlights Koxinga's strategic acumen and critiques the VOC's narratives—particularly those of Governor Frederick Coyett in *'t Verwaerloosde Formosa (The Neglected Formosa)*—which characterized Koxinga as a “barbaric pirate” while overlooking his political objectives, naval tactics, and the legitimacy of his resistance to colonial occupation.

This perspective aligns with Edward W. Said's theory of “Orientalism,” reflecting the stereotypical and negative portrayals of Eastern leaders in early Western accounts (Shan, 2013). In contrast, Blussé (2008) argues that Zheng Chenggong's maritime empire constituted a complex network comparable to those of the European powers, enabling him to impose a trade blockade on Dutch Taiwan. This interpretation presents Zheng as a geopolitical and economic strategist rather than merely a pirate. Wills (1974) also supports this view, emphasizing Zheng's capacity to integrate maritime trade with military strategy.

3.1 The Image of Koxinga in Dutch Literature

In Dutch literature sources, Zheng Chenggong is primarily regarded as a formidable challenger to the 17th-century colonial enterprise of the VOC in East Asia. The VOC's *Dagregisters van het Kasteel Zeelandia, Taiwan (臺灣城日誌)* depict Zheng as a powerful military leader whose actions posed a significant threat to the Dutch trading network in Asia (Blussé & Everts, 2000: 450–520). He is portrayed as a pirate king who disrupted Dutch trade and colonial expansion by severing VOC trade routes and cutting off supplies of silk, porcelain, sugar, tea, and other goods, thereby reflecting the vulnerability of Dutch colonial ambitions in Asia.

In 1675, Frederick Coyett, the final Dutch governor of Taiwan, was granted amnesty and returned to Amsterdam. Under the pseudonym “C.E.S.,” he published *'t Verwaerloosde Formosa (The Neglected Formosa)*, in which he portrayed Zheng as the “Alexander of the East.” This work characterizes the siege of Fort Zeelandia as brutal and unyielding, emphasizing Koxinga's use of “barbaric tactics” and a “no-

cost offensive” strategy that ultimately compelled the Dutch to surrender after a nine-month encirclement (Fang, 2025). A century later, in 1775, the dramatist Joannes Nomsz adapted Coyett’s narrative into a play titled *Antonious Hambroek, of de belegering van Formosa*, further vilifying Koxinga as a “ruthless Eastern conqueror,” a “cunning tyrant,” a “treacherous rebel,” and a “barbaric heathen” who tortured prisoners and persecuted “God’s chosen people” (Church History, 1988). These representations exemplify a broader pattern of Orientalist stereotyping prevalent in early modern European literature. However, historical evidence suggests a more nuanced reality. Upon the Dutch surrender in 1662, Zheng Chenggong permitted the garrison to depart Taiwan fully armed and under their flag, thereby preserving their military honor (Keliher, 2003). This action suggests that Koxinga was not the irrational and barbaric despot portrayed in Dutch sources, but rather a disciplined and strategic military leader.

Blussé (2008) further critiques the VOC’s colonial administration in Taiwan, which was marked by violent exploitation, including the forced labor and subjugation of the local population. From this perspective, Zheng’s military victory may be viewed as a paradigmatic instance of “colonial blowback.” Andrade (2011) contextualizes Zheng’s expulsion of the Dutch within the broader framework of global colonial competition, emphasizing how his commercial networks and military campaigns skillfully leveraged regional geopolitics to reshape trade and cultural linkages between Dutch, Japanese, and Chinese spheres. This historiographical shift reframes Zheng Chenggong not merely as a Chinese anti-colonial hero, but as a complex historical actor situated at the intersection of empire, commerce, and resistance. It also reflects a growing trend in Dutch colonial historiography toward adopting a global perspective—one that situates local events, such as the fall of Dutch Formosa, within the wider transnational dynamics of the early modern world.

3.2 The Image of Koxinga in Spanish Literature

Spanish perceptions of Zheng Chenggong were primarily based on records from the 17th-century colonial authorities in Luzon (the Philippines). Due to the absence of direct military conflict between the two parties, Zheng’s image was shaped more indirectly. He was depicted as a titled yet throne-less “pirate merchant,”

characterized by arrogance, ruthlessness, and extreme capriciousness. He was said to have established a strict hierarchy, bore a fearsome sneer, and was widely notorious for his various “atrocities” against the Dutch in the East Asian seas and Taiwan (Anna, 2016). Spanish missionary accounts, particularly from the Dominican Order, described Zheng as a “champion of Confucian paganism,” whose regime emphasized the Hua-Yi distinction (the differentiation between Chinese and barbarians) and rejected foreign religions. He was also portrayed as a “tyrant who persecuted Christians,” with emphasis on his army’s suppression of the Dutch Christian communities that remained in Taiwan (Alvarez, 1930; Diego, 1962; Mateo, 2009).

Zheng Chenggong’s maritime merchant network controlled key Chinese commodities such as silk, porcelain, sugar, and tea, thereby indirectly influencing the trans-Pacific trade route from the Philippines to Acapulco, Mexico. The connection between the Manila Galleon trade and Zheng was primarily reflected in the 17th-century trade competition and geopolitical conflicts in the East Asian seas, as well as in the challenges his maritime network posed to Spanish colonial authority. This trade route was crucial to Spain’s economic interests in Asia (Mateo, 2009). By exercising control over Xiamen and Taiwan and employing military intervention, Zheng’s maritime merchant group monopolized trade—including smuggling—between China, Japan, and Southeast Asia, threatening the flow of Chinese goods re-exported through Manila and thereby undermining the profitability of the Spanish Manila Galleon trade (Chen, 2013).

After Zheng Chenggong’s death, his son Zheng Jing (King of Dongning) continued to govern Taiwan. However, the Zheng family’s trade network gradually declined due to the Qing dynasty’s enforcement of the “maritime prohibition” and the “coastal evacuation order.” It was not until 1683, when Shi Lang of the Qing conquered and unified Taiwan, that the trade environment for the Manila Galleon somewhat improved; by that time, however, the Spanish Empire was already in decline.

3.3 The Image of Koxinga in Portuguese Literature

Portuguese perceptions of Zheng Chenggong were more indirect and ambiguous compared to those of the Dutch and Spanish. After Portugal occupied Macau in 1557,

it relied on Chinese goods exported to Japan for profit. Following the rise of the Zheng family (Zheng Zhilong and Zheng Chenggong), they monopolized East Asian trade through military force. The Zhengs compelled the Portuguese to purchase trade licenses to access certain ports and shipping routes; vessels operating without such licenses risked seizure. As a result, Zheng was often referred to in Portuguese records as the “Pirate King of China” (Andrade, 2008) and was perceived as a destabilizing force who disrupted established commercial channels and threatened Portuguese trading interests in the region. The Portuguese Jesuits viewed Zheng as a “pagan strongman.” Compared to the Dutch’s intense hostility and the Spanish’s fear, Portuguese perceptions of Zheng were notably more indirect and vague (Boxer, 1951).

4. The Image of Koxinga in Eastern Literature

4.1 The Image of Koxinga in Japanese Literature

Zheng Chenggong has been the subject of various cultural interpretations, shaped by both his lineage and historical role. In 1715, the Japanese playwright Chikamatsu Monzaemon (近松門左衛門) composed the jōruri (puppet theater) play *Kokusenya Kassen* (國姓爺合戦), depicting Zheng as a “Japanese samurai hero.” This image was further reinforced during the Meiji Restoration (1853–1889), a period marked by rising Japanese nationalism and imperial expansion. At that time, some scholars reimagined Zheng as an embodiment of bushidō (Japanese Spirit), emphasizing his loyalty, courage, moral integrity, and spiritual resolve (Jiang, 2006). Japanese admiration for Zheng was not based solely on his partial Japanese ancestry but, more importantly, on his maritime exploits—defending against foreign powers (the Manchus) and defeating the Dutch, a major Western colonial force. As such, he was celebrated as “a son of Greater Japan” (吾大東日本之人) and revered as a “great hero of East Asia” (東亞大英雄).

Zheng Chenggong’s birthplace in Hirado, Nagasaki Prefecture, still preserves historical sites associated with him. Matsuura Hiroshi (まつうら ひろし), the 35th

head of the Matsuura family, praised Zheng's achievements. The Kyoto-based Confucian scholar Asakawa Zen'an (あさかわ ぜんあん) authored the Biography of General Zheng Chenggong (鄭成功將軍傳, ていせいこうしょうぐんでん), and in 1852 commissioned the monument The Commemorative Inscription for the Birthplace of Lord Zheng Yanping (鄭延平王慶誕芳跡). This monument is emblematic of Japan's official recognition of Zheng's identity and historical significance (Japan Koxinga Memorial Museum, n.d.). In 1952, Ishihara Michihiro (いしはら みちひろ) published *Koxinga*, documenting key events in Zheng's life, including his activities in Taiwan and East Asia and his support of Southern Ming loyalists. The work also explored Zheng's (Zheng's father) life in Japan and critically examined Zheng's appeal to Japan for military assistance in resisting the Qing (Xu, 2019). The "Koxinga culture" in Japanese literary and historical discourse has endured, with admirers erecting shrines and statues (such as mother-and-son monuments) in his honor. To this day, Hirado City hosts the annual "Koxinga Festival" to commemorate his legacy (Japan Koxinga Memorial Museum, n.d.).

In the 1890s, Japan's interest in Zheng Chenggong reached its peak, as it sought to justify its military occupation of Taiwan by asserting continuity with Zheng's legacy (Wu, 1995). During the Japanese colonial period in Taiwan (1895–1945), the regime skillfully emphasized Zheng's purported "Japanese lineage," portraying him as both a liberator of Taiwan and a "Japanese-descended hero" who had resisted Qing rule. This narrative aimed to position him as "a son of Japan" within Taiwanese society (Kou & Cao, 2020). By promoting the idea of "Japan and Taiwan as One Family" and weakening Taiwanese identification with the Qing (China), Japan presented itself as the rightful heir to Zheng's governance of Taiwan and reinforced the "Japanese-Taiwanese Common Origin Theory" between the two societies (Chen, 2021; Zhang, 2019). Implicitly, Japan regarded Zheng as a pioneering "Japanese" figure in the development of Taiwan. To reinforce this interpretation, the Japanese colonial administration transformed the Yanping Prince Shrine in Tainan into the "Kaisan Shrine" (dedicated to Koxinga) as part of a symbolic effort to legitimize Japanese rule. After Japan's defeat in 1945 and Taiwan's retrocession to China, the

Kuomintang's policy of de-Japanization effectively erased the Japanese-style image of Zheng from Taiwan's public memory (Croizier, 1977).

In the postwar period, Japanese scholarship on Zheng Chenggong has concentrated on three primary areas: (1) the Zheng family's maritime trade networks and their interactions with Japan and the Dutch; (2) the diplomatic implications of Zheng's Sino-Japanese heritage in East Asia; and (3) Zheng's leadership of the Ming loyalist regime and his efforts to maintain sovereignty amid trilateral power struggles involving China, Japan, and the Netherlands (Andrade, 2011; Carioti, 1996; Vickers, 2021).

4.2 The Image of Koxinga in Taiwanese Literature

Taiwan's perception of Zheng Chenggong's identity is marked by diversity, complexity, and even contradiction. It encompasses collective memory grounded in historical legacy, divergent interpretations shaped by political positions, and evolving representations shaped by folk beliefs and cultural symbolism. After 1949, the Kuomintang (KMT) government portrayed Zheng in official education (such as textbooks) as a symbol of "resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming," emphasizing his deeds of "expelling foreign invaders (the Dutch) and reclaiming Taiwan." He was designated a "national hero," ranked alongside figures such as Yue Fei and Wen Tianxiang, with particular emphasis on his loyalty to the Ming dynasty. His maritime and sea power characteristics were downplayed in favor of promoting the narrative that Taiwan was the rightful bearer of orthodox Chinese culture. This narrative, which opposed Manchu (Qing) rule, served as a spiritual emblem for the KMT's ideological struggle against the Chinese Communist Party, positioning Zheng as a model for KMT governance in Taiwan (Chou, 2012). In 1991, Wen (1991a, 1991b) published two articles in *CommonWealth Magazine*, highlighting Zheng's policies and his role in embedding Chinese culture in Taiwan. This viewpoint was echoed in KMT-sponsored historical works, which emphasized Zheng's role in transforming Taiwan from a Dutch colony into a Han Chinese society.

In Taiwanese folk belief, there are more than 50 temples primarily dedicated to Zheng Chenggong—such as the Yanping Prince Shrine in Tainan. He is respectfully

referred to as Koxinga and honored with titles like “Sacred King Who Opened Taiwan,” widely regarded as the “founding figure of Taiwan’s development.” However, influenced by postcolonial theory, some contemporary Indigenous groups in Taiwan have called on the government to reassess Zheng’s legacy, particularly his seizure of Indigenous lands and acts of violence. Drawing on Dutch and Qing historical sources, critics argue that Zheng initiated a Han colonial project, deconstructing the narrative of him “opening Taiwan” as the beginning of Han settler colonialism (Tsai, 2009; Pu, 2002). Zheng’s image in Taiwan functions, in essence, as a “historical prism,” refracting the island’s deep internal divisions over identity, collective memory, and future direction. Whether in temple rituals, textbook narratives, or Indigenous protests, Zheng remains an unavoidable “burden of complicit social legacy” within Taiwanese society.

4.3 The Image of Koxinga in Indigenous Taiwanese Literature

Taiwanese Indigenous perceptions of Zheng Chenggong encompass issues of historical memory, ethnic relations, and cultural interpretation. Across various Indigenous groups—particularly those in western Taiwan—there exists a marked divergence between their recollections of Zheng and the dominant Han-centric narrative. While the expulsion of the Dutch in 1662 is celebrated by Han communities as the “recovery” of Taiwan, for some Indigenous peoples, it signified the onset of yet another wave of foreign colonization. During the Ming Zheng regime, a *tuntian* (military-agricultural integration) policy was implemented. In contrast to the VOC, this approach involved no negotiations or treaty-making with Indigenous communities. From the Indigenous perspective, the Zheng military’s occupation and cultivation of their lands represented a more direct and aggressive use of force than that experienced under Dutch rule—marked by military encroachment and the violent seizure of ancestral territories (Wang, 2010).

According to the *Records of the Conquest (Cóng Zhēng Shí Lù)*, Zheng Chenggong once issued an order stating: “No disputes or encroachments upon lands currently cultivated by Indigenous peoples or commoners shall be allowed. Any violations will be strictly punished according to the law” ([Ming] Yang, n.d.: 219–224). A similar account appears in the *Essential Records of the Fujian Seas (Mǐn Hǎi Jì Yào)*

([Ming] Xia, n.d.: 199). The *Unofficial Records of Taiwan* (*Tái Wān Wài Jì*) records that Zheng issued military orders requiring his officers and soldiers to cultivate land separately according to their respective commands, allocating land for development by region. During the process of clearing and claiming land, they were prohibited from seizing plots already cultivated by Indigenous peoples or Han settlers. These measures aimed to protect the original rights of local inhabitants and to prevent Zheng's subordinates from adopting a conqueror's attitude in forcibly taking land from civilians. Furthermore, it was mandated that maps of the cultivated areas be submitted for Zheng's review and approval before any land grants were issued. Unfortunately, just as these policies were beginning to take shape, Zheng fell ill and passed away ([Qing] Jiang, R. S., n.d.: vol. 5, 37).

The policy of *yubing yú nóng* (military-agricultural integration) led to the loss of land for Indigenous peoples and created a survival crisis, resulting in multiple conflicts between the two groups. According to the research of Luo (2019) and Guang (2011), Zheng Jing, the King of Dongning, adopted a far harsher and more forceful approach to land enclosure and governance of Indigenous peoples than the Dutch colonizers. For example, he brutally suppressed the Dadu (大肚), Shalu (沙轆), and Zhú Qiàn (竹塹) tribes. Among these conflicts, the 1670 "Shalu Tribe Incident" was particularly severe; it was crushed by Zheng's military commander Liu Guoxuan (劉國軒), leaving only six survivors who fled to Haikou (Lian, n.d.: vol. 15, 3; [Qing] Huang et al., 1722: 177). This event has been characterized by some Indigenous groups and scholars as a "massacre," with Zheng branded as an "executioner" (Luo, 2019; Zheng, 2024; Zhang, Wang, & Su, 2016; Huang, 2016).

However, historical evidence shows that the incident occurred in 1670, while Zheng Chenggong had already died in 1662. Therefore, these accusations are more likely attributable to his subordinates, such as Liu Guoxuan, or his successor Zheng Jing (the King of Dongning). Nonetheless, critics argue that as the leader of the Ming Zheng regime, Zheng bears indirect responsibility for the conflicts caused by the *yubing yú nóng* (military-agricultural integration) policy. Even if Zheng did not

personally order the suppression or massacres, his land reclamation and military policies inflicted profound harm on Indigenous peoples (Lin, 2001).

In July 2016, five Indigenous teachers poured red paint on the statue of Zheng Chenggong in Tainan to protest the official glorification of him as a “national hero” or “Sacred King Who Opened Taiwan,” arguing that this narrative overlooks his oppression of Indigenous peoples (Hong, 2016). Some scholars, drawing on colonial discourse, have called for the removal or reinterpretation of Zheng’s statues and memorial halls to promote historical justice (Tsai, 2017; Chen, 2021). In response, the government organized a ritual of ancestral veneration and spiritual redemption at Luermen Zhenmen Temple (鹿耳門鎮門宮) as a formal apology to Indigenous communities (Luo, 2019; Chen, 2021), and the President officially apologized to Indigenous peoples on behalf of the government (Presidential Office of the Republic of China, 2016).

In Taiwan, the construction of Zheng Chenggong’s image primarily stems from the Kuomintang’s political propaganda after 1949, which is largely disconnected from the historical experiences of Indigenous peoples (Croizier, 1977; Chen, 2007). This ruler-centered narrative—aligned with those of Dutch and Japanese colonial powers—portrays Indigenous peoples as “uncivilized” and “barbaric” in order to legitimize acts of conquest (Weng, 2008; Kang, 1999). Zheng’s actions must be understood within the 17th-century context of colonization and warfare, a time when conquest and colonization were global norms. His policies of land reclamation and military suppression were not uniquely directed at Indigenous peoples, but rather reflected responses to the military and economic pressures of using Taiwan as a base to resist the Qing dynasty. The tendency among some Indigenous groups to label Zheng purely in negative terms overlooks the constraints of his historical context and his political aim of resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming. This perspective challenges the traditional Han Chinese historical narrative and reminds us that history should not be confined to a single voice, but should instead embrace diversity and recognize the memories and traumas of different ethnic communities.

4.4 The Image of Koxinga in Kuomintang's Literature

After the Nationalist government (KMT) was defeated and retreated to Taiwan in 1949, it encountered a population shaped by a complex and layered historical experience—including periods of Dutch rule (1624–1662), Ming Zheng rule (1662–1683), Qing rule (1683–1895), and Japanese colonial rule (1895–1945). In response, the KMT adopted the spirit of Zheng Chenggong as a cornerstone of its national narrative, aiming to foster a sense of Chinese national identity among the Taiwanese people and to legitimize its reconstruction efforts and resistance to the Communist threat (Croizier, 1977). Just as Zheng had introduced Han culture to Taiwan during the Ming Zheng period and cultivated a Han identity among Ming loyalists (Cheng, 2007), the KMT positioned him as a symbol of cultural continuity. Western scholars such as Keene (1951) have argued that Zheng's upbringing in Japan reflects a significant degree of cultural hybridity. However, the KMT narrative focused instead on his Confucian education in Nanjing and his loyalty to the Ming dynasty. As Croizier (1977) observed, the KMT's celebration of Zheng emphasized his military, cultural, and political achievements while selectively downplaying his mixed heritage, his background as a pirate, and his ties to East Asian maritime power structures. In doing so, the KMT reimagined Zheng as a staunch defender of Han culture and Confucian values, thereby oversimplifying his complex identity and historical context. Scholars such as Keliher (2003) have criticized the KMT for employing Zheng as an instrument of Chinese nationalism—strategically leveraging his identity to legitimize its rule in Taiwan and to promote its cultural agenda (Blussé, 2003). This strategy aimed to appropriate the Taiwanese people's emotional reverence for Koxinga (Hsu, 1996; Chen, 2010).

Secondly, during Taiwan's martial law period (1949–1987), the KMT drew upon the educational model of the Ming Zheng era and Zheng Chenggong's fearless nationalist spirit. Through schools and media, it sought to instill in the younger generation ideals such as the "righteous duty between sovereign and subject" (君臣之義) and the "sacrifice of life for righteousness" (捨生取義), rooted in the "righteousness doctrine of the spring and autumn tradition" (春秋節義). These values served as the ideological foundation for the KMT's mission of "retaking the

mainland” and restoring the lost homeland (Hsu, 1996; Chen, 2010). The KMT positioned Taiwan as the stronghold of Chinese cultural revival and sharply criticized the Chinese Communist Party for destroying Confucian ethics and betraying national interests, portraying it as alien to the Chinese nation. This narrative elevated Chiang Kai-shek as a heroic national leader (Lee, 2015) and fostered a sense of responsibility to rejuvenate the nation and resist communism (Su, 2013). Regrettably, the KMT’s actions echoed the authoritarianism of Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan. It reconstructed the Yanping Prince Shrine—originally a Minnan-style structure—into a northern Chinese architectural form, embedding the KMT emblem into its newly built archway. This act unmistakably imprinted the shrine with the party’s mark. In addition, the annual ritual in Tainan honoring Zheng was designated as a state-sponsored ceremony, symbolically turning Zheng into a model of loyalty to the KMT—thus reinforcing the party’s legitimacy in ruling Taiwan (Zhang, 2019).

A Historical Encounter:

In the late Ming dynasty, amid frequent warfare, Zheng Chenggong raised the banner of resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming. Taiwan subsequently came under the rule of Zheng Chenggong, Zheng Jing, and Zheng Keshuang. A comparable historical episode unfolded 266 years after the fall of the Ming Zheng regime, when the KMT, having been defeated in the Chinese Civil War, retreated to Taiwan in 1949. When compared with the Ming Zheng period:

One was a resistance against foreign rule (the Manchus), involving the expulsion of the VOC from Taiwan and the declared goal of resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming to reestablish the old order. This served to legitimize the ruler’s authority and the justness of the anti-Qing cause (Chou, 1994). The other was the KMT, which retreated to Taiwan in 1949 after defeat, appropriating the legacy of Zheng Chenggong under the banners of “retaking the mainland” and “national revival.” It imposed authoritarian military rule and martial law to suppress opposition within Taiwan, while waiting for an opportunity to return to the Chinese mainland and restore its legitimate government.

Under the objective of resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming, strong economic support was essential. Zheng Jing (King of Dongning) actively engaged in maritime trade across East Asia and expanded taxation; similarly, Chiang Ching-kuo (蔣經國) pushed for Taiwan's economic development, helping it become one of the Four Asian Tigers. Both Zheng and his son Zheng Jing died in Taiwan, as did Chiang Kai-shek (蔣介石) and his son Chiang Ching-kuo. The Zheng family expelled the Dutch and brought settlers from Fujian and Guangdong; meanwhile, the Chiang family repatriated Japanese residents from Taiwan back to Japan and welcomed refugees from various Chinese provinces fleeing the war. The KMT used Zheng's identity to package and legitimize itself, but they seemed to forget that 80% of Taiwan's population was of Minnan descent. While praising Zheng's spirit on one hand, they simultaneously suppressed his mother tongue—Minnan (Hokkien, the native language). Ultimately, history proved that the mission of "retaking the mainland" was unachievable.

4.5 The Image of Koxinga in Chinese Literature

China's portrayal of Zheng Chenggong emphasizes his resistance against imperial colonial oppression, his expulsion of Dutch colonizers to reclaim Taiwan, and his defense of national territorial sovereignty and integrity. He is celebrated for safeguarding China's significant position in East Asian waters and even global maritime affairs. His steadfast opposition to the Qing dynasty and loyalty to the Ming dynasty exemplify a heroic image of national righteousness, dignity, and patriotism (Zhang, 2013). Zheng is honored as an immortal national hero whose deeds inspire unity and underscore the fact that both sides of the Taiwan Strait belong to one China (Croizier, 1977).

On the fourth page of the 1949 issue of People's Daily, it was noted that "many Taiwanese people revere the 'national hero' Zheng Chenggong from 300 years ago" (Wang, 1949). On September 5, 1954, the front page of People's Daily published an article titled A Message to Taiwan Compatriots, stating: "When Zheng mobilized his army to reclaim Taiwan in 1661, he received enthusiastic support from the Taiwanese people, ultimately defeating and forcing the surrender of the Dutch

colonial troops” (People’s Daily, 1954). On January 1, 1979, the front page of People’s Daily published another Message to Taiwan Compatriots, solemnly declaring that the government of the People’s Republic of China would seek to end the military standoff with Taiwan’s authorities through peaceful negotiations and realize the long-held aspiration of peaceful reunification (Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress of China, 1979).

With the normalization of cross-strait relations, Zheng Chenggong’s image has evolved into that of a friendly cultural envoy connecting both sides. Fujian’s Minnan region—Zheng’s ancestral home and also the origin and residence of many Taiwanese—is central to this connection. His enduring influence can awaken memories among the Taiwanese people, deepen the spiritual affinity between the peoples on both sides, and help realize the vision of peaceful coexistence envisioned over a century ago.

4.6 The Evolving Identity and Image of Koxinga Across Different Eras

Regarding the various roles and representations attributed to Zheng Chenggong across different countries/regions, historical periods, and cultural systems (as detailed in Table 1), Eastern narratives primarily frame his image through the lenses of politics, culture, and ethnic identity. In contrast, Western perspectives tend to focus on colonial interests, maritime trade, naval power, and military dimensions.

The Qing dynasty’s attitude toward Zheng Chenggong’s identity shifted from initial contempt to respect, largely due to the Mudan Incident, which underscored Taiwan’s strategic importance and Zheng’s influence among the local population. This prompted the Qing to adopt a more conciliatory stance toward Zheng’s legacy, aiming to transform his image into one that would foster local cohesion against foreign threats. Consequently, Zheng’s anti-Qing and Ming restoration ideals were reframed by the Qing as expressions of loyalty to the sovereign and patriotism.

During the Edo period, Japan emphasized Zheng Chenggong’s mixed heritage and adventurous spirit, constructing him as a “Japanese-style hero.” In the nineteenth century, this narrative was mobilized for colonial propaganda, portraying Zheng as a Japanese-descended hero who expelled the Dutch, liberated Taiwan, and resisted the

Qing—thus legitimizing Japan’s colonial rule by framing it as a continuation of Zheng’s anti-Qing, pro-liberation spirit. Contemporary Japanese scholarship tends to regard Zheng as a “legendary figure of the East Asian maritime era,” highlighting his cultural hybridity and historical significance rather than political affiliation.

Table 1: Comparative Narratives of Zheng Chenggong’s Image Across Different Eras and Countries/Regions

Era		Image	Key Influencing Factors
Late Ming		Loyalist, Hero of Ming Restoration, Maritime Hegemon	Ming-Qing wars, colonialism
Qing dynasty	Early Qing	Sea Rebel, Pirate, Rebel	Ming-Qing wars, colonialism
	Mid Qing	Remnant Official of the Fallen Ming, Model of Loyalty	Legitimization of Qing rule
	Late Qing	Hero Against Foreign Invaders, Loyal Patriot	Mudan Incident (1871–1874)
Western Countries/Regions	Netherlands	Savage Pirate, Military Leader, Ruthless Conqueror, Pagan	Maritime trade and naval rivalry, loss of Taiwan
	Spain	Pirate Merchant, Regional Threat, Pagan	Security of the Philippines, maritime trade and naval rivalry
	Portugal	Pirate Merchant, Troublemaker, Pagan	Maritime trade and naval rivalry
Eastern Countries/Regions	Japan	Son of Japan, East Asian Hero, Japanese-descended Hero	Imperial expansion, Japanese colonialism, cultural affinity
	China	Cross-Strait Cultural Envoy, Anti-Western Colonizer, Defender of Territory, National Hero Who	Emphasis on unification narrative

		Recovered Taiwan	
	Taiwan	Loyal Subject, Sacred King Who Opened Taiwan, National Hero, Anti-Qing Symbol	Cultural orthodoxy, national identity
	Indigenous Taiwan	Foreign Ruler, Invader, Taiwan's Columbus	De-colonization narrative portraying rulers as barbarians

In the West, the VOC regarded Zheng Chenggong as a formidable challenger in East Asia—a fearsome “Oriental barbarian pirate” who instilled fear in European colonial powers such as the Dutch, Spanish, and Portuguese. His actions had a significant impact on local trade and colonial expansion. What these colonial powers feared was not only his military strength, but also the rise of an Eastern system capable of unifying maritime forces and challenging European dominance in trade. This reflected the geopolitical and geo-economic competition in East Asia at the time. In his account, Frederick Coyett portrayed Zheng as a “barbaric heathen”—a depiction that not only highlighted Zheng’s military prowess but also served, indirectly, to deflect criticism of Dutch colonial failures. It also exposed the Dutch’s lack of understanding of Zheng’s anti-colonial stance and political motivations.

The orthodox Chinese historical narrative downplays Zheng Chenggong’s background in maritime trade and sea power, instead emphasizing the theme of “resisting the Qing and restoring the Ming.” Western literature, viewed through the lens of colonial economic interests, often portrayed Zheng as a powerful yet brutal pirate or heathen—reflecting prevalent biases and negative depictions of non-Western leaders at the time. Fic (2006) criticizes Western academia for marginalizing Zheng’s victories, attributing this to Eurocentric prejudice that obscures successes outside of Europe. Such stereotypical representations align with Edward W. Said’s theory of Orientalism, revealing a historically biased Western interpretation of Eastern political figures.

In Taiwan, Zheng Chenggong is widely revered. Since 1949, the KMT has frequently invoked Zheng’s spirit in official education and ceremonies to legitimize its

“counterattack on the mainland” agenda. China views Zheng as an anti-Qing hero, anti-colonial pioneer, and patriotic defender of national sovereignty; his “recovery of Taiwan” symbolizes territorial integrity and resistance to foreign forces, reinforcing cross-strait ties and asserting Taiwan’s historical belonging to China. However, Indigenous perspectives diverge markedly, criticizing Zheng as an “executioner,” “invader,” “foreign ruler,” and “Taiwanese Columbus,” emphasizing his role in Han colonization while often neglecting the seventeenth-century historical context and his political goal of anti-Qing restoration.

5. Conclusion

Zheng Chenggong’s identity and image have evolved across different historical periods and regions, taking on sharply contrasting meanings in the narratives of various countries and cultures. His portrayal extends beyond that of a military commander or statesman. In the eyes of Western colonizers, he commanded the largest navy in East Asia, combining commerce with plunder, and posed a significant threat to colonial interests. The image of the “Oriental Pirate King” was, at its core, a product of struggles over power, trade, maritime dominance, and ideological confrontation. From the Chinese historical perspective, Zheng’s pirate background and mixed Chinese-Japanese heritage are deliberately downplayed, while the narrative of him as a national hero is emphasized. In contemporary cross-strait relations, he has become a focal point in the contest over identity, image, and recognition between “China” and “Taiwan,” revealing the close entanglement between historical narrative and political power.

Zheng Chenggong’s influence transcends the time and region of his life, profoundly shaping the perceptions and cultural memory of subsequent generations. His identity and image cannot be singularly defined. The evolution of his identity and image prompts reflection on how historical figures are reconstructed to serve contemporary geopolitical or geo-economic interests, depending on who tells the story and for what purpose. However, such narratives also result in the simplification and politicization of authenticity. The evolving image of Zheng essentially represents a form of “history that is exploited,” reflecting the ideological demands of different eras.

Future research is recommended to re-examine Zheng Chenggong's complexity from an interdisciplinary perspective, with particular attention to the supplementary role of non-textual sources such as folk beliefs and traditional opera. Additionally, studies could focus on indigenous peoples, Han Chinese, and Dutch mixed descendants; or employ textual mining to analyze the evolution of Zheng's image in popular media; or adopt global history approaches to explore the localization of Zheng's legacy across East Asia. Such research would not only deepen the understanding of the Ming Zheng period but also provide valuable insights for contemporary dialogues on Zheng's identity and historical memory.

Acknowledgements

The Phase Achievements of the 2024 Guangdong Province Philosophy and Social Sciences Planning Project (GD24CMK07).

Conflict of interest

The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest involved with any parties in this research study.

References

1. Alvarez, J. M. (1930). *Formosa geográfica e historicamente considerada*. Libreria Catolica Universal.
2. Andrade, T. (2008). *How Taiwan Became Chinese: Dutch, Spanish, and Han Colonization in the Seventeenth Century*. Columbia University Press.
3. Andrade, T. (2011). *Lost Colony: The Untold Story of China's First Great Victory Over the West*. Princeton University Press.
4. Anna, B. A. (2016). Dreams in the Chinese Periphery: Victorio Riccio and Zheng Chenggong's Regime, in Tonio Andrade and Xing Hang (eds.), *Sea Rovers, Silver, and Samurai: Maritime East Asia in Global History*, pp.1550-1700. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
5. Blussé, L. (2003). *Around and About Formosa: Essays in Honor of Professor Ts'ao Yung-ho*. Foundation for Culture and Education.

6. Blussé, L. (2008). *Visible Cities: Canton, Nagasaki, and Batavia and the Coming of the Americans*. Harvard University Press.
7. Blussé, L., & Everts, N. (2000). *The Formosan Encounter: Notes on Formosa's Aboriginal Society, A Selection of Documents from Dutch Archival Sources, Vol.2 1636-1645* [Traditional Chinese Edition] (Vol. 2). SMC Publishing Inc.
8. Boxer, C. R. (1951). *The Christian Century in Japan: 1549-1650*. University of California Press.
9. Carioti, P. (1996). The Zhengs' Maritime Power in The International Context of The 17th Century Far Eastern Seas: The Rise of A "Centralised Piratical Organisation" and Its Gradual Development Into an Informal "State". *Ming Qing Yanjiu*, 5(1), 29-68. <https://doi.org/10.1163/24684791-90000353>
10. Chen, C. C. (2010). The Analysis of Geo-political Code in Zheng's Dynasty. *East-Asia Review*, (468), 103-114. <https://doi.org/10.29705/EAR.201006.0008>
11. Chen, F. M. (2007). Transitional Justice and Taiwan's History. *Si Xiang*, (5), 83-94. <https://doi-org.proxyone.lis.nsysu.edu.tw/10.29848/SX.200706.0005>
12. Chen, K. T. (2013). *A Millennium of East Asian Maritime History*. Taipei: Yuan-Liou Publishing.
13. Chen, W. H. (2021). Folk Religion and Memory Politics: Yanping Junwang Temple and the Construction of National Identity. *Taiwanese Sociology*, (42), 61-108.
14. Cheng, K. J. (2007). Calligraphy in Taiwan during the Koxinga Era. *Journal of Applied Chinese*, (2), 173-219. <https://doi-org.proxyone.lis.nsysu.edu.tw/10.6391/JAC.200706.0173>
15. Chou, M. F. (1994). *A Concise History of Taiwan*. Taipei: Avant-Garde Publishing.
16. Chou, W. Y. (2012). *Essays on Maritime and Colonial Taiwan*. Taipei: Linking Publishing, pp. 145–150.
17. Church History (1988). *Executed Dutch Missionaries*. Taiwan Church News. Retrieved from <http://www.laijohn.com/book1/044.htm>
18. Clements, J. (2005). *Coxinga and the Fall of the Ming Dynasty*. Sutton Publishing.

19. Croizier, R. C. (1977). *Koxinga and Chinese Nationalism: History, Myth, and the Hero*. Harvard University Asia Center Publications Program. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1tfjb5b>
20. Diego, A. de. (1962). *Historia de la Provincia del Santo Rosario dela Orden de Predicadores en Filipinas, Japón y China/ Revmo. Sr. Don Fray Diego de Aduarte*. Madrid, Spain: Departamento de Misionologia Española.
21. Fang, Y. S. (2025). Exploring 17th Century Formosa: The Dutch Colonial Period (1624-1662). *RA Journal of Applied Research*, 11(7), 570-582. <https://doi.org/10.47191/rajar/v11i7.07>.
22. Fic, V. (2006). *The Forgotten War: The Sino-Dutch Conflict*. University of Toronto Press.
23. Gao, G. Q. (n.d.). *Taiwan Fu Zhi*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=184850>
24. Guang, T. (2011). *The Battle of Salach - The 228 Incident of the Plains Indigenous People*. Taiwan Tati Cultural and Educational Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.taiwantt.org.tw/tw/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3442&Itemid=57
25. Hang, X. (2015). *Conflict and Commerce in Maritime East Asia: The Zheng Family and the Shaping of the Modern World, c. 1620–1720*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Hong, R. Z. (July 28, 2016). *Was Koxinga Blood-Red Tyrant? Indigenous Teachers Splash Paint in Protest for Transitional Justice*. China Times News. Retrieved from <https://www.chinatimes.com/realtimenews/20160728005144-260407?chdtv>
27. Hsu, C. T. (1996). *Modern Development History of Taiwan*. Taipei: Avant-Garde Publishing.
28. Hsu, Y. C. (2014). *The Misunderstood Taiwan: A Complete Account of the Decisive Battle at Taijiang Between the Dutch and Zheng Forces*. Retrieved from <https://www.peoplemedia.tw/news/3cb340ca-f65b-4330-acd4-d659e87f688f>
29. Huang, J. X. (2016). *What Taiwan's Chinese History Books Don't Tell You: The*

- “National Hero” Koxinga’s Landing and the Massacre of a Central Indigenous Tribe, Leaving Only 6 Survivors. CitiOrange. Retrieved from <https://buzzorange.com/citiorange/2016/12/02/evil-zheng-cheng-gong/>
30. Huang, S. J., Gu, Z., Wei, L. T, Wei, X. S., & Liu, X. T. (1722). *Tái Hài Shǐ Chá Lù*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=108946>
31. Japan Koxinga Memorial Museum (n.d.). *What's the best way to reach the Koxinga Memorial Museum?*. TEI-SEI-KO Memorial Museum. Retrieved from <https://teiseikokinenkan.com/zh-TW/access>
32. Jiang, L. Q. (n.d.). *Dong Hua Lu Xuan Ji*. the Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=151432>
33. Jiang, R. J. (2006). *Deconstructing Zheng Chenggong: The History of a Hero, Myth, and Image*. Taipei: Sanmin Bookstore.
34. Jiang, R. S. (n.d.). *Tái Wān Wài Jì*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=612985>
35. Kang, P. D. (1999). *Colonial Encounters and Imperial Periphery: Historical Transformation of Indigenous Peoples in Hualien Region from 17th to 19th Centuries*. Taipei: Daoxiang Publishing.
36. Keene, D. (1951). *The Battles of Coxinga: Chikamatsu’s Puppet Play, its background and importance*. Taylor's Foreign Press, London.
37. Keliher, M. (2003). *Out of China: or Yu Yonghe's tale of Formosa: A history of seventeenth-century Taiwan*. Taipei: SMC Publishing Inc.
38. Kou, S. T., & Cao, S. Q. (2020). The Identification of Zheng Chenggong with Displacement: Centered on the Different Writing by Chinese and Japanese Scholars. *Journal of Henan University(Social Science)*, (1), 43-50. <https://doi.org/10.15991/j.cnki.411028.20200217.003>.
39. Lee, X. F. (2015). *From the Zheng Regime to the Chiang Regime*. Yahoo News. Retrieved from <https://tw.news.yahoo.com/-100037491.html>

40. Lian, H (n.d.). *General History of Taiwan*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=798087>
41. Lin, C. M. (2001). The Evolution and Influence of Aboriginal Land Policies in Different Periods in Taiwan. *Journal of Taiwan Land Research*, (2), 23-40. [https://doi-org.proxyone.lis.nsysu.edu.tw/10.6677/JTLR.199105_\(2\).0002](https://doi-org.proxyone.lis.nsysu.edu.tw/10.6677/JTLR.199105_(2).0002)
42. Luo, Y. C. (2019). The Statue of Koxinga from a Transitional Justice Perspective. *Indigenous literature*, (41), 21-27.
43. Ma, Q., Zhang, T. Y., Jiang, T. X., & Zhu, S. (n.d.). *Qing Shi Lu Kangxi Chao Shi Lu*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=852061>
44. Mateo, J. E. B. (2009). *The Spanish Experience in Taiwan 1626-1642: The Baroque Ending of a Renaissance Endeavour*. Hong Kong University Press.
45. Nie, D. N. (1998). Zheng Chenggong in the Eyes of Western Scholars. *Study of Chinese History*, (4), 164-167. doi:CNKI:SUN:ZGSJ.0.1998-04-020.
46. Peng, S. Y. (n.d.). *Jing Hai Zhi*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from the <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=975356>
47. People's Daily (1954). *Message to Compatriots in Taiwan*. People's Daily, p. 1. Retrieved from <https://cn.govopendata.com/renminribao/1954/9/5/1/#114441>
48. Presidential Office of the Republic of China (August 1, 2016). President Issues Apology on Behalf of the Government to Indigenous Peoples. Retrieved from <https://www.president.gov.tw/news/20603>
49. Pu, Z. C. (2002). *Rethinking Indigenous Peoples*. Taipei: Avant-Garde Publishing.
50. Shan, T. H. (2013). Power, Politics, and Culture: An Interview with Edward W. Said. *Tamkang Review*, 44(1), 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.6184/TKR201312-7>
51. Shen, B. Z. (n.d.). *Fú Jiàn Tái Wān Zòu Zhé*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=561990&remap=gb#p94>
52. Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of China (January 1, 1979). *Message to Compatriots in Taiwan by the Standing Committee of the National*

- People's Congress of the People's Republic of China*. People's Daily, p. 1. Retrieved from <https://cn.govopendata.com/renminribao/1979/1/1/1/#510508>
53. Su, W. H (2013). The Continuation, Reinforcement, and Reinvention of Nationalist "Traditions": Focus on Taiwanese Intellectual Elites' Writings about the "Chinese Nation Theory" during the Martial Law Period (1949-1987). In Proceedings of the 2013 Taiwan Social Research Association Annual Conference: *Returning to the Public - From Normative Discourse to Local Historical Interpretation* (pp. 17-18). Taipei: Shih Hsin University.
54. Tai, P. T. (2001). *The History and Legends of Koxinga*. Wu San-Lien Taiwan Historical Materials Foundation. Retrieved from https://www.twcenter.org.tw/thematic_series/history_class/tw_window/e02_20010430
55. Tsai, C. W. (2009). Indigenous Peoples Customary Land Tenure and Governance Structure: Case Study of the Sediq Peoples. *Journal of natural and human environment of indigenous peoples*. *Indigenous Natural and Cultural Journal*, (1), 111-144. <https://doi.org/10.29875/JNHEIP.200909.0004>
56. Tsai, M. H. (2017). Imagery of Zheng Cheng-gong and Re-Chinalization of Taiwan (1945-1963). *Journal of Humanistic Studie*, 51(1), 85-108. <https://doi.org/10.3966/241195042017045101005>
57. Tsai, P. J. (2015). A brief of Cheng Chen-Kong's image in western literature. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, (16), 117-139. [https://doi.org/10.6394/JHSS.201507_\(16\).0005](https://doi.org/10.6394/JHSS.201507_(16).0005)
58. Vickers, E. (2021). Three faces of an Asian hero: Commemorating Koxinga in contemporary China, Taiwan, and Japan. In Chris Shei (Ed.). *Taiwan: Manipulation of Ideology and Struggle for Identity*. Routledge. Chapter.
59. Wang, E. H. (2005). Studies on the Position of Zheng's Overseas Trade Group in 17th Century. *Academic Monthly*, (8), 103-107. <https://doi.org/10.19862/j.cnki.xsyk.2005.08.015>.
60. Wang, L. Z. (1949). *The People's "July 7th" Commemoration*. People's Daily, July

7. Retrieved from <https://cn.govopendata.com/renminribao/1949/7/7/4/#38727>
61. Wang, S. F. (2010). Critical Analysis on Historical Personages of Taiwan and Context on Social Studies Textbook of Elementary School. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 5(1), 101-127.
62. Wen, Y. P. (1991a). The Fall of the Zheng Dynasty - Incorporation into China's Territory. *Common Wealth Magazine*, (6). Retrieved from <https://www.cw.com.tw/article/5117201>
63. Wen, Y. P. (1991b). Koxinga's Roots and Settlement - The Ming-Zheng Period. *Common Wealth Magazine*, (6). Retrieved from <https://www.cw.com.tw/article/5117225>
64. Weng, J. I. (2008). *The Continuity Problem in Taiwan's History During the Dutch Era*. Taipei: Daoxiang Publishing House.
65. Wills, J. E., Jr. (1974). Pepper, Guns, and Parleys: The Dutch East India Company and China, 1662-1681. Harvard University Press, pp. 58-62.
66. Wu, W. X. (1995). Investigations and Research on Taiwan Before Japanese Occupation. In Proceedings of the *First Academic Conference on Taiwan Local Culture* (pp. 573-574). National Taiwan Normal University.
67. Xia, L. (n.d.). *Mín Hǎi Jì Yào*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=750288>
68. Xu, S. Z. (2019). The Construction and Evaluation of Koxinga's Image - With Discussion on Its Impact and Enlightenment for Our Navy. *Naval Officer*, 38(1), 52-59.
69. Yang, Y. (n.d.). *Cóng Zhēng Shí Lù Xiān Wáng Shí Lù*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=283575>
70. Yu, Y. H. (n.d.). *Pí Hǎi Jì Yóu*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=793583>
71. Zhang, L. P., Wang, S. Y., & Su, X. (2016). *April 30th - Koxinga's Landing: A Central Taiwan Tribe Massacred, Only 6 Survivors! Tribespeople: Hope Taiwanese Can View 400 Years of History Differently*. Mata Taiwan.

<https://www.matataiwan.com/2016/05/01/koxinga-for-plain-indigenous-people/>

72. Zhang, L. Z. (2019). *Was Koxinga a Pirate or a National Hero? Here's What a Researcher from Academia Sinica's Taiwan History Institute Says*. Research Matters. Retrieved from <https://storystudio.tw/article/gushi/chang-lung-chih>
73. Zhang, P. Z. (2013). *Maritime Power Strategy: Chronicles of the Zheng Zhilong and Zheng Chenggong Merchant Fleet*. Guangzhou: Flower City Press.
74. Zheng, Z. D. (n.d.). *Selected Essays of the Late Qing Dynasty*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=415550>
75. Zheng, Z. L. (February 21, 2024). *Tainan's 400th Anniversary (Part 3) [Cheng Tzu-lung Column] Was Koxinga a Brutal Military Leader?*. People News. Retrieved from <https://www.peoplenews.tw/articles/19fc08bc2f>
76. Zhu, K. Z. (n.d.). *Zhōng Xīng Jiàng Shuài Bié Zhuàn (Chén Wén Sù Gōng Bié Zhuàn 3)*. Chinese Text Project. Retrieved from <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=2793453#p5>